

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-2, 6-14, and 18-25 are pending. Claims 1, 6, and 13 are hereby amended. Claim 25 is hereby added. Claims 1 and 13 are independent. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed, and specifically at page 10 (lines 16-21), page 11 (lines 3-13), and page 13 (lines 5-13).

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 7-9, 13, and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,838,383 to Chimoto et al. (hereinafter, merely “Chimoto”) in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0047942 to Vorenkamp et al. (hereinafter, merely “Vorenkamp”) in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2005/0204389 to Proehl et al. (hereinafter, merely “Proehl”) and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,835 to Foster et al. (hereinafter, merely “Foster”).

Claims 6 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chimoto in view of Vorenkamp, Proehl, and Foster, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,198,479 to Humpleman et al. (hereinafter, merely “Humpleman”).

Claims 2, 10-12, 14, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chimoto in view of Vorenkamp.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections because (a) the Office has failed to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness and (b) none of the cited references teach all features of the claimed invention.

A. Office has failed to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office has failed to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicants respectfully submit that the initial burden rests on the Office to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and that Applicants have no burden to argue non-obviousness until the Office has provided a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Applicants respectfully submit that Vorenkamp and Foster, both of which are relied upon by the Office in an obviousness rejection, are not prior art to the present application. The present application is entitled to a foreign priority benefit based on Japanese Application No. 11-327160, filed on November 17, 1999. Foster is not prior art under any of the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102, since Foster’s earliest effective filing date in the U.S. is March 23, 2000.

Vorenkamp is not prior art under any of the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102, since Vorenkamp’s earliest effective filing date in the U.S. is December 15, 1999, based on a provisional application. Additionally, the relied-upon portions of Vorenkamp, paragraph [0844], has no support in

Vorenkamp's provisional application. Thus, Vorenkamp is only entitled a December 15, 2000 filing date for paragraph [0844].

Therefore, since neither Vorenkamp nor Foster are prior art under any of the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102, the Office has failed to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and all of the outstanding rejections are overcome.

B. Cited references fail to teach all claim limitations

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“... a plurality of digital signal processing blocks including at least a signal processing block for decoding data of streams, **each of said plurality of digital signal processing blocks having a processing unit;**

... wherein said processing unit of each of said digital signal processing blocks interprets and executes said command, and

wherein said data streams may be assigned high priority and transmitted at high speed.” (Emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing has been found in the cited references, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest that **each of the digital signal processing blocks has a processing unit, where the processing unit interprets and executes the command.** Additionally, none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest that **data streams may be assigned high priority and transmitted at high speed,** all as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable.

Claim 13 is similar in scope and is therefore patentable for similar reasons.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800